



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/622,291	08/09/2000	Bernard Agasse	11345.025001	9720

22511 7590 06/03/2003

ROSENTHAL & OSHA L.L.P.
1221 MCKINNEY AVENUE
SUITE 2800
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER

PWU, JEFFREY C

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3628

DATE MAILED: 06/03/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/622,291

Applicant(s)

AGASSE ET AL.

Examiner

Jeffrey Pwu

Art Unit

3628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/18/2003 amendment.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 29-48 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 29-48 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 11.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 3628

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 29-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Xidos et al.* (US 5,851,149) in view of *Rosen* (US 6,336,095) and further in view of *Thorner et al.* (US 6,422,941).

Xidos discloses an interactive gaming and audiovisual transmission system substantially claimed including:

a central gaming computer means for processing gaming data (col.1, line 47-col.2, line 14); and

a receiver/decoder for receiving broadcast audio visual data relating to a broadcast event, and for receiving from the central gaming computer means gaming data relating to the broadcast event (col.36, line 11-col.39, line 45); the receiver/decoder including:

a subscription card reading device for interacting with a user's subscription card for providing user access to a broadcast event (13, 16; also see applicant's specification at page 2, lines 25-30, inherently a smart card or credit can be used as a subscription card);

Art Unit: 3628

a bank card reading device for interacting with a user's bank card to read data stored thereon (16); and

a modem device (36b) for communicating data read from the user's bank card to a communication server connected to a bank server holding the user's bank account for transferring in response to said data credit from the user's bank account to a gaming account at the central computer means in order to permit gaming in relation to the broadcast event.

However, *Xidos* fails to show an electronic certificate generated by a bank card in response to transaction data submitted by the receiver/decoder or an outcome of the broadcast event is not produced in response to a user.

Rosen is applied for showing that it is conventional, in interactive TV systems, to purchase and process a gaming data by using a trusted agent (e.g. electronic/digital certificates) to facilitate various transactional data. (col.6, line 61- col.9, line 67).

Thorner is applied for showing that it is well known in the art that the outcome of a broadcast event is not produced in response of a user by invoking a demonstration mode (col.11, line55-col.13, line 43), therefore the event's outcome is not produced due to the user's response.

It would have been obvious at the time of the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art in view of the teaching of *Rosen* and *Thorner* to use an electronic certificate to process the data transaction between a merchant and customer for the purpose of a

Art Unit: 3628

valid and more secure transaction and select a demonstration mode so that the user has no substantial participation in effecting an outcome of a broadcast event.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 29-48 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

⇒ Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the Examiner should be directed to Jeffrey Pwu whose telephone number is (703) 308-7835.

Jeffrey Pwu



1 June 2003

JEFFREY PWU
PRIMARY EXAMINER